

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/665,788	09/17/2003		Robert S. Schwartz	20220-502	6741	
37374	7590	02/14/2006		EXAM	IINER	
10/665,788 09/17/2003 Robert S. Schwartz 37374 7590 02/14/2006 INSKEEP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP, INC 2281 W. 190TH STREET SUITE 200			·			
	INSIKE	EI		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
TORRANCE	, CA 90	504		3738		

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		SVR
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/665,788	SCHWARTZ ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bruce E. Snow	3738
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	he correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perional Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS ute, cause the application to become ABANI	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	January 2006	
	nis action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under		
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdreds 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2005 is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	dare: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ ole the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Pection is required if the drawing(s)	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Appliority documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sum	mary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 	Paper No(s)/N 5) Notice of Infor	lail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawing submitted 11/30/05 are accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said body lumen" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kensey et al (5,409,44, applicant cited on IDS 1/21/05) in view of Bouvier (WO 99/04832, applicant cited).

Kensey et al teaches a device comprising:

a sealed membrane including 202 forming an inner cavity,

Art Unit: 3738

a medium disposed in said inner cavity, said inner cavity having a portion sized for placement external to said body lumen 206 and a portion sized for placement internal 202 to said body lumen, said medium being movable between said internal and external portions in response to pressure fluctuations in said body lumen, thereby therapeutically dampening pressure fluctuations in the body lumen.

However, Kensey et al is silent regarding a media port. Bouvier teaches a similar compliance device including a port. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have included the port as taught by Bouvier on the compliance device of Kensey et al such the medium could be adjusted to best suit the patient.

Regarding claim 2, see element 208.

Kensey et al teaches the device using a gas and wherein the external portion 206 can be variable (which could except a liquid), however, fails to teach a using a liquid. Lacking any criticality in the specification the use of a liquid in lieu of that used by Kensey et al produces no advantage and is considered an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have utilized a liquid which is more compatible to the blood than a gas in case of failure.

Kensey et al teaches urethane but fails to teach silicone. Lacking any criticality in the specification the use of silicone produces no advantage and is considered an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of have silicone as a flexible biocompatible material (see column 4, lines 33-41 of Kensey et al) which is easily moldable and low priced.

Kensey et al fails to teach a coating of a biocompatible configuration. It would have been obvious to one skill in the art to have utilized a coating configuration on at least element 208 to increase sealing where the implant extends through the vessel wall.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce E Snow whose telephone number is (703) 308-3255. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (703)308-2111. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bes

BRUCE SNOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 4